DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 354 610 EA 024 669

AUTHOR Schmuck, Richard A.
TITLE Beyond Academics in the Preparation of Educational Leaders: Four Years of Action Research.
INSTITUTION Oregon School Study Council, Eugene.
REPORT NO ISSN-0733-2548
PUB DATE 93
NOTE 11p.
AVAILABLE FROM Oregon School Study Council, University of Oregon, 1787 Agate Street, Eugene, OR 97403 ($6 prepaid; $3 postage and handling on billed orders).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Journal Articles (080)
JOURNAL CIT OSSC Report; v33 n2 p1-10 Win 1992

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; Administrator Role; Educational Administration; Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; *Instructional Leadership; *Leadership Training; *Management Development; Mentors; Principals; School Administration
IDENTIFIERS *Oregon

ABSTRACT

This document describes the outcomes of a 2-year experimental administrator preparation program implemented in Oregon in 1988. The first year of the program consisted of seven weekend institutes that focused on administrative skills and contemporary concepts of instructional leadership. The following summer, participants took four school management courses and participated in the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) Assessment Center program, a field-based mentoring experience, and five seminars for the mentoring pairs. Four evaluation substudies found that: (1) most participants were capable of articulating a coherent leadership philosophy and applied the skills learned during their mentorship; (2) participants in the experimental program had more favorable attitudes toward their training program and a deeper understanding of leadership than did their traditional program counterparts; (3) experimental participants were much more successful in procuring administrative positions than were their traditional counterparts; and (4) most experimental participants negotiated their first year quite successfully. It is recommended that other colleges of education try out the following program elements: selecting outstanding teacher-leaders for principal preparation; preparing trainees in cohorts; establishing a balance in the curriculum between instructional leadership and school management; employing a professor-administrator team to teach each leadership institute; using the NASSP Assessment Center before participants begin their internships; requiring half-time internships with mentors; and maintaining a supportive peer network during and after the program. Four tables are included. (Contains 13 references.) (LMI)

ED354610

OSSC REPORT

OREGON SCHOOL STUDY COUNCIL

Volume 33, Number 2 Winter 1993

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

INSIDE

Around the State

Reynolds Math Specialist Uses 'Mind's Eye' to Teach Math p.11

Estacada Junior High Begins Team Teaching p.11

Nongraded Classrooms Allow Students to Work at Their Own Pace p.12

Habits of the Heart at Roosevelt Middle School p.14

Sutherlin Disciplines Tobacco Use as Substance Abuse p.15

Technology Brings Change to Crow-Applegate-Lorane School District p.15

Medford School District and SODA Lead Strong Drug Programs p.16

First Graders Evaluate Standardized Testing p.17

Miscellany

Can Oregon Learn Anything From South Carolina? p.19

Series on Collaboration with Social Service Agencies Adds Fifth Volume p.20

Harold Hodgkinson: Going by the Numbers p.21

Bulletins in Review

Schools Can Implement Effective Tutoring Programs to Help At-Risk Students p.22

Schools Serve ESL Students p.23

Schools Teach Study Skills to Students p.23

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Piele

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 024 669

Beyond Academics in the Preparation of Educational Leaders:

FOUR YEARS OF ACTION RESEARCH

by Richard A. Schmuck

Introduction

In March 1988, the Division of Educational Policy and Management submitted a proposal to the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education for a project whose aim was to demonstrate that a field-based, collaborative principal preparation program can be both feasible and practical. The project, which was subsequently funded, took place over a two-year period, beginning in September 1988. Those who designed the project** hoped that participants enrolled in the alternative administrator preparation program would be better equipped by the end of their two-year experience to assume, and successfully maintain, administrative positions than students in traditional preparation programs.*

A cooperative venture involving the University of Oregon, the Confederation of Oregon School Administrators, and the Oregon School Boards Association, the project began in September 1988. It created learning opportunities based in research but also attempted to bring students closer to the real world of educational practice, thereby trying to avoid a criticism often leveled against administrator preparation programs—that they are too theoretical. The following article discusses project components in detail and reveals the findings of several substudies designed to measure the effectiveness of this innovative program.

In September 1988, a cohort of twenty-five teacher-leaders was chosen to take part in a two-year experimental preparation program in school administration. Unlike most other programs in educational administration, this program gave equal attention to instructional leadership and school management, took place among a supportive cohort of teacher peers, and provided each participant with over 750 hours of school-based work under the guidance of a mentor.

The first year of the program consisted of seven weekend institutes (each fifteen hours) that focused on administrative skills and contemporary concepts of instructional leadership. The following summer, participants took four school management courses and went through the NASSP Assessment Center program for principal aspirants. The second academic year featured the field-based mentorship experience along with five twenty-hour seminars for participants and their mentors. Participants completed the program during the second summer with two management courses.

Four evaluation substudies, described in more detail later in this article, were conducted to assess the effectiveness of the program. The first focused on participants' reactions to the leadership institutes, and their application of leadership-related concepts and skills during the second-year mentorships. The results showed that most participants were capable of articulating a coherent leadership philosophy as neophyte administrators, and that they applied the skills of

* The project was funded by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, United States Department of Education.

** Others who contributed significantly to the project were Jane Adrian, Suzanne Cusick, Bev Gladder, Kip Gladder, Karen Lachman, and Charles Sharps.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OSSC Governing Board

Dave Cone, School Board Member, Gresham Grade SD 4
Mike Delvin, School Board Member, North Bend SD 13
James Maxwell, Superintendent, Lane ESD
Philip K. Piele, Professor and Executive Secretary, Oregon School Study Council
David Conley, Associate Professor, Division of Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon
Bill Korach, Superintendent, Lake Oswego SD 7J
Bob Stalick, Superintendent, Greater Albany Public SD 8J
Diane Harr, School Board Member, Oregon School Boards Association

OSSC Staff

Philip K. Piele, Executive Secretary
Stuart C. Smith, Editor
Linda Lumsden, Associate Editor
LeeAnn August, Desktop Design
Audrey Muller, Publications Sales Manager

OSSC Report (ISSN 0733-2548) is published three times a year, fall, winter, and spring, by the Oregon School Study Council, College of Education, University of Oregon, 1787 Agate Street, Eugene, Oregon 97403. Telephone (503) 346-5044. Fax (503) 346-2334. Material published herein is neither endorsed by nor official policy of the OSSC except where so stated. Subscriptions are provided to superintendents and board members of OSSC-member school districts as part of the cost of OSSC membership. Send inquiries about membership to the above address. Special library subscription is $49 (which also includes the ***OSSC Bulletin***). Second class postage is paid at Eugene, Oregon. Copyright: 1993, by the Oregon School Study Council.

participation, collaboration, and teamwork during their mentorships.

The second substudy compared participants with a matched set of controls on their attitudes toward the administrative training programs they each experienced, and on how they conceptualized leadership and management. The results showed that the experimental participants had more favorable attitudes and a deeper understanding of leadership and management than their counterparts in the control group.

The third substudy focused on the administrative positions that the participants were able to secure after completing the program. Results revealed that the experimental participants were much more successful in procuring administrative positions than were students just finishing a traditional administrative preparation program.

The fourth substudy focused on participants' actual performance as first-year school administrators by collecting data from their superordinates, peers, and subordinates. The results showed that most experimental participants negotiated their first year as an administrator quite successfully.

The next section provides information on research findings that played a key role in informing the project. In addition, it identifies weaknesses that tend to plague current administrator preparation programs and mentions principles about administration that served as the foundation for the project.

Background and Origins

This project grew out of two assumptions: (1) the principal has a powerful, pivotal role in the facilitation of instructional improvement; and (2) contemporary principal preparation programs are not effectively helping prospective principals to acquire the concepts and skills that are necessary for instructional leadership.

Importance of the Principal

Never before in our nation's quest for educational excellence has there been greater awareness of the principal's role as the primary change agent. Virtually all the reviews of research on effective schools published during the past decade mention the principal's crucial role in inspiring leadership for excellence (e.g., Andrews and Soder 1987, Austin and Garber 1985, Bossent 1985, Brookover 1981, Corcoran 1985, and Edmonds (1979).

Despite public pressure, until recently not much attention has been given to improving the competence of principals, even though researchers demonstrated over twenty-five years ago how important principals are to school effectiveness. In a classical empirical study, Gross and Herriott (1965) showed that principals' leadership behaviors influenced student learning. Effective principals offered teachers constructive feedback, showed sincere interest in improving the quality of teaching and learning, gave teachers the sense that they could improve student performance, and made teachers' meetings valuable forums for discussing instructional improvement.

Now, more than a generation later, researchers and policy makers concur on the importance of the principal as change agent. Roueche and Baker (1986) identify seven characteristics that, when developed in school principals, will lead to improvements in student learning: (1) flexibility in direction, (2) teamwork within the school, (3) commitment to students, (4) recognition of staff, (5) problem solving through collaboration, (6) effective delegation, and (7) focus on teaching and learning.

Richard A. Schmuck

Current Practice in Preparing Principals

By and large, university programs to prepare school principals have not been very imaginative. A 1983 policy report entitled *The Preparation and Selection of Principals* characterized administrator preparation programs as too theoretical. The report recommended field-based experience as a significant part of the total program (Southern Regional Education Board 1983). Our own research at the University of Oregon's Center for Educational Policy and Management showed that, from the practicing administrator's point of view, there is an ever widening gap between the theoretical and practical aspects of the principal's role (see Pitner 1982).

Most principal preparation programs suffer from at least three weaknesses: (1) insufficient collaboration between university education professors and key practicing administrators; (2) insufficient attention given to helping prospective administrators in linking theoretical knowledge to their actions; and (3) insufficient focus on helping prospective administrators diagnose and respond to human situations.

During the 1980s administrator preparation programs tried to overcome weaknesses by instituting internships. Most of those internships have not been maximally effective, however, because: (1) the preparation does not occur over sufficient time; (2) the preparers—university professors and field supervisors—do not collaborate closely enough; (3) deliberately planned efforts are not made to establish trainees' cognitive linkages between theory and practice; (4) insufficient attention is given to the emotional development of the trainees and the social support they receive throughout the internship; and (5) although interns have received supervision from experienced administrators, they have not received much mentoring, that is, close and supportive help in an equalitarian and collegial relationship.

Project Description

We start the project description with a statement about its conceptual foundation and then describe how participants were selected and how the two-year program was designed and implemented.

Conceptual Foundation

The task of the school principal is to lead and manage in a way that promotes student learning. Whereas leadership concerns arousing, engaging, and satisfying teachers' desire to excel, management entails providing teachers with a sense that the school is running efficiently and effectively. Successful principals exhibit leadership by articulating visions of the "good" classroom and by modeling openness to feedback from teachers and students. They exhibit management skill by eliciting data on how things are going in the school and by sponsoring quality circles or implementing some other strategy to encourage continual efforts to increase the school's efficiency.

According to Keirnes-Young (1984), research indicates that effective principals perform at least four roles: (1) *action researcher*, who sees that evaluative data are collected regularly and then uses them to mobilize teacher action; (2) *social architect*, who builds collaboration among teachers and uses such things as teams, cabinets, committees, task forces, quality circles, and informal groups to improve instruction; (3) *staff developer*, who seeks ways to help teachers grow, and is concerned with personal, professional growth and with organizational development of the school; and (4) *political strategist*, who builds coalitions within the school and with key people outside the school to improve student learning. The political strategist deals directly with conflict.

By combining Keirnes-Young's categories with the concepts of leadership and management, we established the elements that would comprise our preparation programs, displayed in table 1.

Program Design and Implementation

During the first year, this innovative design replaced one three-credit-hour course on leadership in the traditional curriculum with seven weekend institutes on instructional leadership. Each institute started on Friday evening, ended just after noon on Sunday, and lasted for 15 hours, giving students a total of 105 hours on instructional leadership compared with 30 hours in the traditional curriculum. Each institute was taught by a team consisting of at least one university professor and one practicing school administrator.

The seven weekend institutes were as follows:

1. *Teambuilding: The Skills of Communication, Meetings, and Problem*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Solving. This institute sought to create a spirit of teamwork in the cohort and to help participants practice and hone their skills in three areas: communication, meetings, and problem solving. Six interpersonal communication skills were practiced: paraphrasing, impression checking, describing another's behavior, describing your own behavior, making clear statements, and describing your own feelings. The meetings skills were agenda building, convening, recording, and debriefing. Problem-solving skills included force-field analysis, brainstorming, and action planning.

2. *Teambuilding: The Skills of Trust Building and Facing Challenges Together*. As part of this institute, one half of the cohort went through an "Adventure Ropes Course" developed by Outward Bound, while the other half discussed procedures to enhance shared decision-making. The ropes course, made up of a series of physical challenges, required group members to help one another both physically and psychologically. At times, group members had to hold, lift, or climb on one another. Moreover, to cope with the challenges, group members had to engage in cooperative planning and solve problems presented by the course. The discussion on shared decision-making focused on what it means to collaborate, what quality circles are like, and how to help a group reach consensus.

3. *School Culture: How to Assess It and Ways to Change It*. This institute focused on how school culture can enhance or inhibit teacher performance and student achievement. Cases were presented to help students understand school culture, and students completed a questionnaire to assess their perceptions of the cultures of their own schools. Discussion about diverse school cultures helped students enlarge their views of what is possible in schools.

4. *School Conflict: How to Analyze and Deal with It*. This institute dealt with conflict resolution at several levels. It examined interpersonal relations, small group dynamics, and complex organizational processes. Through the institute, participants came to realize that conflict is inevitable and that they should not fear it but rather use it to initiate school change and improvement. The institute included a simulation during which participants assumed fictional roles to experience how conflict arises and how it can be resolved.

5. *Creating a Climate for Change*. This institute focused on steps administrators might take to promote school-based change. Principal points made during this institute were that the administrator should: (1) articulate a vision for school improvement and capture that vision in a mission statement; (2) review research, collect data about what is and what should be in the school, and create plans with timelines for change; and (3) seek ways of restructuring the school to stimulate dialogue with the staff about what should be changed in the school.

6. *Working on Curriculum Change*. This institute dealt with implementing curriculum change. It also focused on how school administrators can balance their personal and professional lives. A key point was that essential learning skills and common curricular goals should be linked to program review and program development. Another was that administrators should be able to model effective teaching behavior and demonstrate skill in working with students in the classroom.

7. *The People Part of Leading*. This institute dealt primarily with how to work with others and create a safe, supportive environment. It emphasized the need for administrators to feel empathy for teachers and students, and to realize that there will be a variety of personal interests, values, and goals in any organization. Since the faculty meeting is a key arena for dealing with staff relationships, considerable time was spent reviewing meeting skills, such as convening and recording.

During the summer following the first year, participants studied business, law, and supervision. Content in those courses dealt primarily with school management. That summer closed with all participants going through the NASSP Principal Assessment Center (see Dickson 1987). The protocols from that experience were subsequently used by the participants and their mentors during the second year to build appropriate developmental experiences into the internships.

The design of the second year featured an indepth internship experience in which participants collaborated one-on-one with

TABLE 1 • CATEGORIES OF EFFECTIVE SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION

Roles of Effective Principals	Leadership	Management
Action Researcher	1	2
Social Architect	3	4
Staff Developer	5	6
Political Strategist	7	8

an experienced mentor in running a school. The internships were designed to be half time, but only fifteen participants were able to devote that much time to the internship. In addition, five seminars, which took place every other month and involved both participants and mentors, were held to reflect on the internship experiences. The seminars—each of which was twenty hours long, began on a Thursday evening, and continued all day Friday and Saturday—were implemented in the following order:

1. *Reflecting on the Many Facets of the Principalship*. This seminar sought to clarify the expectations of the participants and their mentors for the internship. Each dyad established agreements concerning how they would work together during the internship.

2. *Trends and Issues in Teacher Evaluation*. This seminar focused on the role of the principal in teacher evaluation. Since the primary reason for teacher evaluation is enhanced student learning, this institute stressed that principals must be capable of using techniques of evaluation for planned change in the classroom. To facilitate teacher improvement, principals must combine technical skills of evaluation with human relations skills.

3. *Strategic Planning, Adult Learning, and Life Planning*. Three interrelated issues of concern to school administrators were dealt with in this seminar. The first focused on how to bring various stakeholders together to work collaboratively on planning for the future of the school. The second emphasized principles of adult learning, including collaborative group spirit, voluntary participation, and respect for individual differences. The third asked participants to apply the concepts of strategic planning and adult learning to their own personal life.

4. *Interpersonal Support, Peer Coaching, and Problems of the Beginning Principal*. This seminar also dealt with three interrelated areas of concern. The first focused on how to build a cohesive administrative team so that each member could receive interpersonal support during periods of crisis. The second dealt with establishing and maintaining a formal program of peer coaching and peer support among teachers in a school. The third focused on special problems that inevitably confront beginning principals.

5. *Dealing with Conflict in the School*. This seminar focused on how labor relations can produce conflict between teachers and administrators, and how such conflict can undermine the school's educational effectiveness. Participants explored strategies and techniques for dealing with labor conflict, and discussed what administrators can do to minimize dysfunctional aspects of conflict.

During the second summer, participants took more coursework on management concerns, such as school-community relations and program evaluation. At the end of that summer, each participant received a certificate in school administration.

Table 2 presents a taxonomy of the skills presented and practiced during the twelve sessions.

Table 3 summarizes how much emphasis was given to each of the skill categories. To obtain these data, we tallied the time allotted for the skill at each session. A skill was considered to have high emphasis when three hours or more were spent on it, moderate emphasis when from one to three hours were spent on it, and low emphasis when under one hour was allotted to it. Table 3 reveals that considerable emphasis was placed on problem solving, communication, and teambuilding throughout the program.

Project Results

Twenty-five teachers entered an experimental two-year principal preparation program that emphasized instructional leadership, cooperation and teamwork, and a rich internship with a mentor. Twenty-four completed the program; one participant dropped out after the first year for personal reasons.

Of the twenty-four participants who finished, eleven were male and thirteen were female. All were white; they ranged in age from twenty-four to forty-four, with a mean of thirty-six at the start of the program. Their teaching experience ranged from two to twenty-two years, with a mean of eleven years. Six had been secondary teachers, thirteen had taught in elementary schools, and five had most recently been special educators or school counselors. Fifteen worked in suburban schools, six in small towns, and three in rural schools. They came from a total of fifteen Oregon school districts ranging in size from 250 to 21,900 students. By the end of the program, all twenty-four had master's degrees, an Oregon administrative certificate, and hours beyond the master's.

Participants' Reactions

We gathered four kinds of data on participants' reactions to the program. The primary source of data was one-on-one indepth interviewing carried out during late spring of the second year, in which participants were asked to describe leadership opportunities during their internships and reflect on how the curricula of the twelve weekend sessions might have affected their internship experiences. Written reactions were also collected after each of the seven institutes and five seminars, year-end written reactions after the first and second years, and essays of personal reflection about the

internships. Content analyses of the data were carried out by two or three coders; ambiguous responses or responses that lacked coder consensus were discarded.

Consistently, participants' reactions to the seven institutes were highly favorable. Regularly, between twenty-one and twenty-three of the twenty-five participants expressed favorable reactions. In particular, participants expressed satisfaction with the concepts and skills presented, the practical emphasis on translating theory into practice, and their feelings of membership and social support within the cohort. They were stimulated by the readings and impressed with the instructors.

As the first year unfolded, six or seven participants revealed fatigue and frustration over the length of the institutes (from Friday evening to Sunday afternoon). After the fourth institute, for example, one participant wrote, "I felt flat this morning. Perhaps the honeymoon period is over and now the regular grind begins. The energy level seemed to be lacking this weekend. Not much enthusiasm or excitement." Because one of the instructors was ill for the sixth institute, participants were given part of Sunday off. One participant wrote, "Thanks for giving us a free Sunday; our families thank you too!" But by the close of the seventh institute, none of the participants seemed frustrated with time spent in the program. On the contrary, all but one participant felt that they had "learned a great deal during the year."

At the end of year one, participants were asked to reflect on their learning experiences, write about program strengths and weaknesses, and make recommendations to improve workshops during the second year. Twenty-two participants completed the assignment. Those data revealed that all participants saw *contributions of practicing administrators as a program strength*. Other identified program strengths were: *teambuilding in the cohort* (17), *leadership-skill practice* (16), the *university-based staff* (15), and *journal writing as a reflective activity* (5). Twelve participants commented on *how much they had grown that year*, both personally and professionally, while six thought their *confidence in assuming leadership positions had increased*. The primary weaknesses noted were that *homework assignments lacked relevancy* (3) and that there was *too little feedback given about their written products* (3).

After the second year, participants were again asked to write about their

TABLE 2 • TAXONOMY OF SKILLS IN THE CURRICULUM

Problem Solving

- Shared decision making—collaborative models, quality circles
- Force-field analysis
- Brainstorming
- STP (situation-target-plan)
- Conflict resolution
  - Clearly defined roles
  - Methods for approaching conflict
- Reflection—individual, team
  - Freewriting
  - Discussion
- Strategic planning
  - Vision/mission statement
- Learning/temperament styles

Communication

- Paraphrasing
- Perception checking
- Describing behavior
- Describing feelings
- Making clear statements
- Listening

Team Building

- Observing school climate and culture
- Gaining commitment of team members
- Developing support networks
- Modeling the spirit of change
- Valuing each team member
- Increasing awareness of group dynamics

Didactics

- Peer coaching
- Encouraging ownership for curriculum

Research

- Data collection—research review, district demographics, student indices, financial resources
- Delphi techniques and focus groups
- Analyze cases and interpret videos

Meetings

- Understand meeting variables—purpose, participants, time activities, responsibilities, arrangement, format, timing, summary/closure
- Agenda building
- Roles: convener, recorder, processor
- Group agreements

learning experiences. Eighteen participants completed that assignment. Again, all participants commented on how *presentations by practicing administrators had continued to be a strength of the program.* All participants also said that the program had *helped them prepare for a school-leadership position.* Other program strengths mentioned were: the *university-based staff* (12), *networking with educators* (9), the *content of the curriculum* (8), and *the assessment-center experience as a confidence builder* (7). The primary weaknesses noted were *too few small group activities* (6), *the Thursday evening sessions* (5), and *followup to the assessment center* (3).

Participants Compared with Controls

Each participant was paired, for measurement comparisons, with a participant in the university's traditional administrative certification program. The two members of each pair were matched on age, gender, rural or suburban community, Miller's Analogies test scores, and performance in the NASSP Assessment Center.

All forty-eight subjects answered the same three questions when they finished the coursework and practicums or internships in their respective programs: (1) What does instructional leadership mean to you?, (2) What do you believe are the key behaviors of effective school leaders?, and (3) What skills and personal characteristics will be most important to future school leaders?

The content of the answers was analyzed by two coders (the author and a graduate assistant) who did not know the name of the subject or whether the subject was part of the innovative program or the traditional program. The coders used the concepts of effective school administration reported in table 1 as content categories for the analysis, and educational leaders' personal attributes and effective communication skills as delineated by Roueche and Baker (1986).

TABLE 3 • EMPHASIS (H, M, L) ON SKILLS IN EACH SESSION

	SESSIONS					
SKILLS	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
Problem solving	H	L	H	H	M	M
Communication	H	M	M	M	M	M
Team building	H	H	M	M	L	L
Didactics	H	L	L	L	M	H
Research	L	L	M	L	H	L
Meetings	M	L	L	L	L	L

	SESSIONS					
SKILLS	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**
Problem solving	M	L	L	H	L	H
Communication	L	L	L	L	M	L
Team building	L	M	L	M	L	L
Didactics	M	L	M	L	H	L
Research	L	L	L	L	L	L
Meetings	H	L	L	L	L	L

H = high emphasis (3 or more hours)

M = moderate emphasis (1 to 3 hours)

L = low emphasis (under 1 hour)

Overall, experimental participants mentioned the categories of effective school administration and leadership more often than members of the control group. For the total of 144 written answers, the coders agreed on a total of 669 responses that fit some part of the category system, with 510 (76 percent) of them originating from experimental respondents and 159 (24 percent) coming from the controls. Thus, program participants wrote three times more often than their counterparts about concepts or skills that fit the researchers' category system on instructional leadership.

Furthermore, these overall results were consistent in each of the three questions, respectively, with experimental respondents outscoring their controls by 123 (80 percent) to 31 (20 percent), 192 (72 percent) to 59 (24 percent), and 195 (74 percent) to 69 (26 percent). An inspection of the data pair by pair also showed that the twenty-four program participants

outscored their mates in twenty-one pairs on question 1, twenty-two pairs on question 2, and twenty-two pairs on question 3. The data showed that significant differences between the program participants and their controls occurred for every one of our categories of effective administration and effective leadership. In particular, the experimental group put three times more emphasis than the controls on effective communication, social architecture, and staff development in each of the three answers on the questionnaire.

The effect of the innovative training design was substantiated when we inspected responses to the same questions above written by the experimental people prior to the start of the program. The coded answers, category by category, in program participants' predata were very nearly identical to controls' postdata. A comparison of those two sets of data revealed that the controls outscored the experimental group by 31 (52 percent) to 29 (48 percent) on question 1, but that the experimental people outscored the controls 65 (29 percent) to 59 (48 percent) and 75 (52 percent) to 69 (48 percent) on questions 2 and 3, respectively. Thus little difference in cognitive structures about instructional leadership existed between the posttrained controls and the pretrained program participants.

Additional data indicated that program participants were much more satisfied with their training program than the controls. Whereas twenty-one to twenty-three program participants expressed favorable reactions to aspects of the program, only thirteen of the controls typically reacted favorably to their certification program. Moreover, whereas the participants most frequently saw instructional leadership as the high point of their program, the controls (eighteen out of twenty-four) saw school law as the most helpful experience in their training program. When we probed further, we found that the experimental people valued instructional leadership because it helped them in being proactive about school improvement while the controls valued school law because it helped them to stay out of trouble.

Participants' Jobs After the Program

Thirteen of the twenty-four participants who completed the program became educational administrators during the school year immediately following their field-based mentorships. That rate of entry into school administration is more than double the typical rate.

Of the remaining eleven participants, all but one chose not to apply for administrative jobs for a variety of reasons. The one participant who did apply came in second for an assistant principalship and was offered the same job a year later. Five participants, all in their mid- or late-twenties, felt that they were too young to gain credibility from older teachers, but each did seek to take on teacher-leader roles, such as chairing district committees and coordinating TAG programs. Two participants added to their families and taught part time for a year, while three, preferring to stay in or near their home districts, waited for administrative posts to become available.

One year later (two years after completion of the program), along with the thirteen who still were administrators, seven more assumed administrative posts for the first time. Four participants remained as teachers, two of whom had decided not to pursue an administrative job in the near future (one middle school teacher had decided to teach geography in high school, and an elementary-school teacher wanted to teach overseas for a while). The success of twenty of twenty-four participants in procuring and maintaining administrative jobs was truly phenomenal.

Participants' Job Performance

We intensively studied the job performance of the thirteen participants who were school administrators during the school year immediately following their completion of the program. Each had worked with a mentor before graduating from the program. Six had had half-time internships, while five had carried out their internships even as they worked full time in teaching assignments. We first interviewed the participants about how they thought the program contributed to their administrative performance. Second, we interviewed a sample of their subordinates, peers, and superordinates to find out how colleagues perceived the performance of the participants.

Self-Perceptions All thirteen believed the program had helped them learn skills of effective administration. In particular, they most frequently mentioned the skills of problem solving (such as the STP procedure, force-field analysis, brainstorming, strategic planning, and conflict resolution), communication (such as paraphrasing, impression checking, and behavior description), and teambuilding (such as gaining commitment, shared decision making, and developing interpersonal support).

All participants also referred to the contribution that the program had made to their ability to facilitate meetings effectively, focusing on the skills of building agendas, executing the convener role, and reaching group agreements about meetings procedures.

Eleven participants believed the program had helped them develop a coherent philosophy of educational leadership that was enhancing their success as neophyte administrators. The

TABLE 4 • COLLEAGUES' PERCEPTIONS OF FIPP-C PARTICIPANTS' BEHAVIORS AS ADMINISTRATORS

Behavioral Statements	Perceptions of Frequency *Always* 6	5-4	3-2	*Never* 1	NA
1. Works cooperatively to develop school goals	17	12	1	0	1
2. Encourages staff to carry out school goals	20	10	0	0	1
3 Is accessible to teachers	20	10	1	0	0
4. Encourages teachers to share problems	20	9	2	0	0
5. Tries to develop team concept	18	11	1	0	1
6. Delegates leadership when appropriate	11	16	3	1	0
7. Helps to develop a schoolwide assessment program	10	16	1	2	2
8. Helps teachers/parents share perceptions about students and plan accordingly	15	9	3	0	4
9. Uses research data to inform decisions about school program	12	16	1	1	1
10. Uses effective meeting skills	20	9	2	0	0

concepts of leading with a vision, articulating a mission, breaking out of old paradigms, making school for children, and creating a community of learners were mentioned repeatedly during the interview.

All thirteen participants believed the program had prepared them well for the principalship. Most experienced "no surprises" as first-year administrators. Three attributed their readiness for administration to the internship, while four others commented on how the knowledge acquired during the first-year institutes had prepared them for their jobs. All noted the value of having teams of practicing administrators and professors to teach them throughout the two years.

Colleagues' Perceptions. Near the end of the academic year, during which thirteen participants acted as school administrators, we asked three of each of their colleagues to assess the participants' performance. The colleagues we nominated to complete the questionnaire were their supervisor, a subordinate with whom they worked, and, when possible, a peer. When a peer was unavailable, as was the case with assistant principals in elementary schools, we chose a second subordinate. In all, thirty-one colleagues completed the questionnaire about twelve participants.

The questionnaire was comprised of ten statements, each calling for a frequency ranking from always (6) to never (1) on a six-point scale, and three open-ended questions, each calling for a written response. Table 4, which summarizes data on the ten statements, shows a heavy concentration of favorable perceptions, particularly about being encouraging and supportive, developing a team concept, and running meetings effectively. Indeed, over 90 percent of colleagues' rankings revealed that they viewed the program participants as frequently executing all ten aspects of instructional leadership in schools.

In the three open-ended questions, the colleagues were asked about the participants' administrative actions: which they should continue, which they should stop, and which they should start doing. Overall, respondents offered a list of seventy-eight actions that should be continued, fifteen actions that should be stopped, and thirty-four actions that should be started. Among actions to be continued were communicating clearly and directly, working effectively with teachers and students, caring and cooperative behavior, making self available, helping others make good decisions, supporting staff development, and being very skillful in group processes. Whereas these actions to be continued were dispersed evenly across all twelve

participants, the actions to be stopped were focused mainly on three participants. One of the latter was seen as being defensive too often and not very open or responsive to some teachers; another was viewed as being too tense and at times too aggressive toward teachers; while a third was seen as being overly sensitive to criticism from teachers. For seven participants, respondents simply wrote "none" to actions they should stop. Among actions to be started, half were complimentary, such as trusting one's intuition, trying to work less, spending more time with other administrators (because they are so good), and continuing to build on the leadership characteristics displayed this year. Among the half that were more critical were learning to work with all types of adults, managing time better, dominating less at staff meetings, and delegating more tasks to others.

Conclusions

Our four-year study showed that the innovative Oregon program for preparing educational leaders was successful. Parts of the program that should be continued and tried out in other colleges of education are: (1) selecting outstanding teacher-leaders for principal preparation who have the support of their districts, (2) preparing trainees in cohorts, (3) establishing a balance in the curriculum between instructional leadership and school management, (4) employing a team of at least one professor and one school administrator to teach each leadership institute together, (5) using the NASSP Assessment Center to diagnose participants' strengths and weaknesses in human relations' skills before their internships, (6) requiring half-time internships with mentors, and (7) maintaining a supportive network of participants during and after the program.

References

Andrews, R.L., and R. Soder, (1987), "Principal Leadership and Student Achievement," *Educational Leadership*, 44, 6, pp. 9-11.

Austin, G.R., and H. Garber, (1985), *Research on Exemplary Schools*. New York: Academic Press.

Bossent, S.T., (1985), "Effective Elementary Schools," in *Reaching for Excellence*, pp. 39-53, edited by Kyle, R.M.J., Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Brookover, W.B., (1981), *Effective Secondary Schools*. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools.

Corcoran, T.B., (1985), "Effective Secondary Schools," in *Reaching for Excellence*, edited by Kyle, R.M.J., Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Dickson, K.G., (1987), "The Oregon Assessment Center: Its Influence on Candidates' Career Opportunities and Professional Development," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR.

Edmonds, R., (1979), "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor," *Educational Leadership*, 37, 1, pp. 15-24.

Gross, N., and R. Herriott, (1965), *Staff Leadership in Public Schools*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Keirnes-Young, B., (1984), "The Principal as an Agent of Change," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR.

Pitner, N., (1982), "Training of the School Administrator: State of the Art," Occasional Paper, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR.

Preparation and Selection of Principals, (1983), Policy report of the Southern Regional Education Board.

Roueche, J. E., and G.A. Baker, (1986), *Profiling Excellence in America's Schools*. Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators.

University Council for Educational Administration, (1987), *Leaders for America's Schools*, The Report of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. Tempe, Arizona: UCEA.